

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/9612

16 March 1981

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

(FOUO 7781)



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING OWNERSHIP OF
MATERIALS REPRODUCED HEREIN REQUIRE THAT DISSEMINATION
OF THIS PUBLICATION BE RESTRICTED FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/9612

16 March 1981

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS
(FOUO 7/81)

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Western Imperialism Blamed for Muslim Insurgency (A.I. Zevelev; VOPROSY ISTORII, Dec 80).....	1
Soviet Policy to Jews Defended, Zionism Attacked (M.A. Gol'denberg; IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK MOLDAVSKOY SSR. SERIYA OBSHCHESTVENNYKH NAUK, No 3, 1980).....	16

- a -

[III - USSR - 35 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

WESTERN IMPERIALISM BLAMED FOR MUSLIM INSURGENCY

Moscow VOPROSY ISTORII in Russian No 12, Dec 80 pp 82-91

[Article by A. I. Zevelev: "International Imperialism -- the Instigator of the Basmak Movement"]

[Text] International imperialism has focused its "attention" on the Soviet East for many decades. The policy of the Western powers has been determined by their hatred of the socialist revolution, which had an enormous influence on the entire world, including the peoples of the non-Soviet East. The imperialist plans to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat and split Central Asia away from the Soviet Union assigned an important role to the Basmak bands.¹ International imperialism played an instigatory, organizing, and directing role in the formation and support of the Basmak movement as a form of anti-Soviet struggle by the local bourgeoisie, feudal lords, bais, mullahs, and kulaks. The movement's ideological foundation was reactionary religious (pan-Islam), chauvinistic (pan-Turkism), and nationalistic. The actual organizers of the Basmak movement were the counter-revolutionary Shura-i-Islam and Shura-i-Ulema organizations in Turkestan. Their direct allies were the White Guards and Turkish, Afghan, and Chinese reactionaries.

Reactionary circles in England and the United States had shown an interest in the Central Asian region during the preceding century. Central Asia attracted particular attention from American colonialists at the turn of the century.² This region interested them for its wealth in minerals, cotton, and cheap labor and its strategically important position.

The Yankee penetration of Turkestan followed the classic plan of colonialism. The first to appear there were "specialists" in the study of "native" culture, ways, and mores, instructors in cotton processing and development of animal husbandry, leaders of geological and railroad surveying parties, archeologists, journalists, and tourists. They collected and processed economic, political, and military data and their "cover" activities in the spheres of cultural education and philanthropy were generously financed. According to incomplete figures, 25 American representatives of different types died in Turkestan in 1903-1913.³ Alongside these "cultural emissaries" diplomatic and military officials appeared, desiring to establish contact with local authorities and the owners of cotton plantations, cotton gins, coal mines, and oil wells. They actively sought out possibilities of receiving

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

concessions, opening divisions of their banks and trade offices, making contracts for railroad construction, and performance of irrigation work.

The first American offices, storehouses, concessions, and commercial and industrial firms appeared in Central Asia. In Tashkent, for example, the Brown Company opened a cotton gin and creamery equipment plant, Stucken and Company opened an enterprise that supplied Central Asia and the Caucasus with machines from the American Limmus Plant, and the Anglo-American J. Block company opened offices representing plants producing hoisting machines, bicycles, typewriters, and the like.⁴ In 1909 Jackson, a representative of American banking circles, formed a company to build a railroad from the Siberian Railroad to Tashkent. H. Hoover, who was backed by the Morgan financial group, was particularly active in "opening up" Central Asia. The Russian-Asian Society was formed at this same time. It owned 2.5 million acres of land, including forests and sources of hydro energy. The society's lands had deposits of gold, copper, silver, and zinc with 12 operating mines, two copper smelting plants, 20 sawmills, and 250 miles of railroad track. It owned steamships, barges, blast furnaces, rolling mills, chemical plants, and dredges.⁵ The Russian-Asian Society had property worth a total of more than 1 billion dollars. The Morgan group also sent the Hammond mission to Turkestan to take control of the development of irrigation projects in the Karakumy.

American and British capitalists worked persistently to establish themselves in the Fergana valley, which later became the center of the Basmak movement. The stock of many companies that exploited the riches of the Fergana region were held by Americans and Englishmen. In 1909, for example, the oil companies of H. Hoover and L. Urquart, after buying the Maylisayskoye petroleum deposits from Russian entrepreneurs, formed the Fergana Oil Industry Society. It also took in the Pamir Gold Industry Society of the Fergana entrepreneur Nazarov, an agent of American capitalists and one of the future leaders of the counterrevolutionary Turkestan Military Organization.⁶ In 1912 W. May, an American who became a member of the Turkestan Trade and Industrial Society, settled in Andizhan. At his initiative the society established contacts with U. S. industrialists,⁷ and the American Vacuum Oil Company opened a storage facility in Kokand. The Central Asian Oil Industry and Trade Association, abbreviated "Santo," and formed in the Fergana region in 1898, was financed by the Russian General Petroleum Corporation, established in London and functioning on the basis of British law.⁸ The Chimion petroleum and mining society formed in 1905 was also linked to English capital.⁹ Two-thirds of the fixed capital of the Kzyl-Kiy Central Asian Hard Coal Society belonged to the St. Petersburg International Commercial Bank, which was connected to English, French, and German capitalists.¹⁰ Shortly before World War I the American corporation Singer Company with stock capital of 50 million rubles opened a division in Russia. It had representatives, warehouses, and stores in virtually all cities and large populated points in the Turkestan region. There is evidence that "the entire vast network of Singer Company agents in Turkestan spent less time selling sewing machines than engaged in espionage; agents of the firm collected information on the occupations of the population, the condition of roads, the sizes of fields and herds, and about industry and trade."¹¹

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Bank capital occupied a special place in U. S. economic expansion. The Russian-Asian Bank (formed in 1910 on the basis of the former Russian-Chinese bank, which was founded in 1896) was one of the largest in Central Asia. It had close ties with American financial capital, particularly with W. Vanderlip and Hoover. The bank had divisions in Tashkent, Samarkand, Kokand, Andizhan, Mergalan, Namangan, Bukhara, Novyy Urgench, Askhabad, Merv, and Kerki. These divisions controlled the activities of almost all the local cotton industrialists and purchased a majority of the shares in the Kokand-Namangan and Tokmak railroads, the Russian Neft' [Oil] Society, the Kokand Electrical Society, and the Central Asian Petroleum Industry Society.¹² The bank granted credit to local cotton entrepreneurs and buyers and owned shares of stock in construction of the Andizhan-Osh railroad, American capital also subsidized the construction of the Fergana railroad, in large part.

U. S. imperialism strengthened its position in Central Asia markedly during World War I. It partially financed construction of the railroad from Bukhara to Termez, carried on irrigation projects in the Golodnaya Steppe and on the Chu River, and extracted petroleum on the Cheleken peninsula. A division of the Russian-American Chamber of Commerce opened in Tashkent and promoted the penetration of American capital into Central Asia. The Marshall Produce Company acquired the enterprises of the German Duerschmidt firm, which had occupied a monopoly position in the food industry of the Turkestan region.¹³ British capital was entering Central Asia at an intensive rate at the same time. One of the London organizations that worked solving "geographic problems" there in the early 20th century was the H. MacMahon mission, which directed British exploratory work in southwestern Afghanistan and the adjacent areas of Iran.¹⁴

The Great October Socialist Revolution crushed the hopes of the Anglo-American imperialists to turn Central Asia into a colony quickly and relatively cheaply. But they did not give up their former plan. U. S. president W. Wilson's "14 Points" and the commentary accompanying them spoke of Central Asia as a future U. S. possession. Point VI reads: "There is no available information which would permit us to form an opinion on a correct policy in relation to Muslim Russia, in short, Central Asia. It is entirely possible that it will be necessary to give some state a limited mandate to govern on the basis of a protectorate."¹⁵ This point was also found in the expanded version of the document ratified by Wilson as the official American program for the Paris peace conference.¹⁶ Speaking at the conference, Wilson mentioned that the system of mandates would spread to "German colonies, the territories of the Turkish Empire, and other territories." When asked what he meant by "other territories," the American President responded: "The former Russian empire," that is, the Caucasus, Central Asia, and other regions.¹⁷ The map compiled by the U. S. State Department for the U. S. delegation showed the regions that were to be taken away from Russia; Central Asia was indicated as a zone of U. S. influence.¹⁸

The bourgeois-bai elements and nationalists immediately called on Wilson for help in the "struggle against the Bolsheviks in Turkestan."¹⁹ One of the Transcaspian White Guards newspapers at that time wrote the following about the plans for intervention along the Karsnovodsk - Samara and Samara - Vladivostok railroad lines: "These two great lines are destined to play a

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

great role in history. They will link the Americans with the most important new fronts today. In the near future we will see detachments of Americans passing through our regions."²⁰

Representatives of English ruling circles, for their part, openly expressed a desire to make Turkestan a British colony.²¹ Speaking in the House of Commons on 4 March 1918 English Secretary of Foreign Affairs A. J. Balfour stated that the government was devoting a great deal of attention to Asian Russia.²² British agents were working hard to put together from bourgeois nationalist elements and the reactionary part of the Muslim clergy a delegation to travel to Paris and put before the peace conference a demand for "liberation of Turkestan from the Bolshevik yoke." London was already working out a program for this appearance.²³ If this plan fell through the imperialists had a plan to set up a kingdom in Central Asia. Negotiations on this subject had been conducted earlier with Seid-Alim Kahn, the Emir of Bukhara. Preparations for open intervention were also made. "English soldiers," a British general said, "will have to stand guard in the oases of Merv and Samarkand."²⁴

But the U. S. assigned its work to R. Treadwell, American general consul in Tashkent. Upon officially presenting himself to the government of the Turkestan Republic in May 1918 he demanded the right to unrestricted travel throughout Turkestan.²⁵ Using his diplomatic immunity, this diplomat coordinated the work of the missions and delegations carrying on espionage and subversion in Tashkent and other cities.²⁶ The representative of the Soviet People's Commissars of the Turkestan Republic F. I. Kolesov observed, in a telegram to the RSFSR Soviet of People's Commissars in the summer of 1918: "Ambassadors and consuls of different countries are flooding Turkestan."²⁷ In the fall of the same year A. F. Sol'kin, representative of the Central Executive Committee of the Turkestan Republic, noting Anglo-American rivalry in Central Asia, said that to the United States Turkestan represented an "especially savory morsel."²⁸

London sent a military-diplomatic mission to Tashkent consisting of Major (according to other information Colonel) F. M. Bailey and Captain (according to other information Major) Blacker. D. McCartney, former English consul in Kashgar, joined them later. J. Castagne wrote of their objectives: "They were given a special mission in relation to local authorities."²⁹ I. M. Zaytsev, a White Guardsman associated with the British emissaries, spoke more openly: "The objective and intentions of the mission were to prepare for and organize an armed uprising against Soviet power in Turkestan and to provide the rebel detachments with money and weapons from English bases closest to Turkestan (Meshkhed, Kashgar, and Afghanistan). The mission had broad powers and authority to carry out these objectives."³⁰ And here is the admission of Bailey himself:³¹ "Soon after my arrival I made contact with those I believed to be the heads of several anti-Bolshevik organizations."³²

The activities of the mission immediately attracted the attention of Soviet governmental agencies. Kolesov reported to Moscow: "The mission is behaving very suspiciously."³³ It made contact with Treadwell and carried on subversive work under his direction. In a lecture in Hong Kong in 1928, Treadwell indicated that "in 1918 I was in contact with the English Colonel Bailey, who was sent from India through Kashgar to Tashkent for deep reconnaissance."³⁴ In his book "Mission to Tashkent," Bailey writes of Treadwell's

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

role in anti-Soviet work: "I cooperated closely with the general consul of the United States. Treadwell maintained constant communications with me, and his support and approval were very precious and valuable to me."³⁵ Using the ideas of pan-Islam and pan-Turkism, Treadwell and Bailey began spreading propaganda for the creation of an "independent Turkestan," unassociated with Soviet Russia. The agent of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs in Turkestan observed that this was a "joint Anglo-American project."³⁶

England established several strongpoints in Iran, Afghanistan, and North-western China and from them directed counterrevolutionary activities in Turkestan. The posts at Meshkhed and Kashgar were especially active. The imperialists were relying most heavily in Turkestan on the Basmak movement, which expressed the class interests of the feudal lords, bais, incipient local bourgeoisie, and reactionary Muslim clergy. Some of the working people occasionally made temporary alliances with the Basmaks for various reasons. But the workers and a large majority of the peasants [dekhkany] of Central Asia fought the puppets of imperialism and the enemies of the popular masses with gun in hand. All the prominent leaders of the Basmaks were hired agents of American and English intelligence. M. V. Frunze pointed out that the Basmak movement, "without strong support among the local population," found its support abroad in English "gold and guns."³⁷

In November 1917 a decision was made to form an autonomous bourgeois government in Kokand, one of the commercial and industrial centers of Turkestan and an important point for pan-Islam and pan-Turkish propaganda. Leaders of the local counterrevolutionary forces had gathered in this city after Great October. The formation of the "Kokand Autonomous Government" was the beginning of secret English intervention in Central Asia.³⁸ Churchill remarked later that the anti-Bolshevik governments that arose on the frontiers of Soviet Russia were defended and supported by troops of the Entente.³⁹ On 15 (28) April 1918 the English Government sent a memorandum to Washington concerning the necessity of intervention in Soviet Russia and support for the White Guard organizations and the "governments in the south and southeast of Russia."⁴⁰ Colonel E. House, advisor to President Wilson, wrote that the occupation of the Siberian Railroad was carried out at this time for the purpose of supporting the "autonomous governments in the southeastern part of Russia."⁴¹

When the Red Guard detachments of Turkestan smashed the "Kokand Autonomous Government" in February 1918, its defenders, among whom was the former criminal Irgash, became the first Basmak "kurbashi" (leaders of criminal bands). Madamin-Bek, a convicted robber who had later worked his way into the position of chief of the local militia division, also became a leader of a band. As the command of the Fergana Front observed, "all organized international imperialism" stood behind him.⁴² By the summer of 1918 a network of Basmak gangs had formed in the Fergana valley. They raided villages, robbed and killed the inhabitants, first of all communists, workers, and rural activists, took hostages, destroyed fields and livestock, ruined irrigation systems, and burned the cotton. They frequently imposed taxes on the peaceful population in the form of grain, rice, and horses; these taxes were 25 times as great as the prerevolutionary tributes. They

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

took women away for their harems and blockaded industrial centers and cities, causing problems with food and water supply.⁴³ The Basmaks tried with special fury to disrupt the work of railroad transportation. Hunger and poverty raged in the fertile Fergana valley and the population lived in constant fear.

It was no accident that Fergana was the main center of the Basmak movement. It was close to China and Bukhara. From Chinese territory the imperialists supplied the Basmaks with guns and, in case of need, sheltered them there. The imperialists also used the exploiter strata of Bukhara, especially the reactionary part of the clergy, for their purposes. The struggle by Soviet authorities against the Basmaks came to be called the Fergana Front. It was not a solid line. Fighting would break out unexpectedly at different points and not last long. The dense population of the Fergana valley and the extremely rugged terrain made it easier for the Basmaks to wage war by bandit methods and at the same time complicated the operations of regular units of the Red Army.

By the summer of 1918 Turkestan was like a fortress under siege. V. I. Lenin, analyzing the situation in the country in the middle of 1918, wrote: "Yesterday the report came in that some of the cities of Central Asia have been seized by the counterrevolutionary uprising with open participation by the English, who have fortified themselves in India, made Afghanistan completely subordinate, and long ago established a base of operations for themselves to expand their colonial possessions, strangle nations, and attack Soviet Russia."⁴⁴ The first fighting between the Red Army and the Basmaks showed that it was not a question of sporadic or scattered actions by individual leaders of bands. It became increasingly clear that the Central Asian counterrevolution was coordinated by a skilled and experienced hand.

The Basmak movement became especially strong in late 1918 in connection with attempts by the enemies of Soviet power to join all the counterrevolutionary forces of Turkestan. It was about in September or early October that Col P. G. Kornilov (the brother of Gen L. G. Kornilov) secretly arrived in Fergana. He carried on negotiations with the leaders of the bands on behalf of the English and assured them of complete support from London. The Bailey mission, which openly traveled around Turkestan, on behalf of his government promised to supply the Basmaks with weapons: "a) from Chitlar-Gilgit through Sustag Pass to Kashgar, and from ~~Chere~~ through Irkeshtem and Osh; b) from Peshevar through the Khyber Pass, then on through Afghanistan and Bukhara." There were no limitations whatsoever on any types of supplies or on money; the English representatives promised to provide what the rebels needed "in adequate quantities when they need it."⁴⁵

Colonel Zaytsev was also sent to Fergana. He and Kornilov were given the mission of reorganizing the Basmak bands into a cavalry corps consisting of two divisions or eight regiments with two mountain cavalry batteries, a total of about 10,000 men. The formation of infantry rifle units was also contemplated. The entire army was to consist of roughly 25,000 men and was to be organized and trained following the model of Cossack units.⁴⁶ These units were supposed to participate in carrying out the plan to overthrow Soviet power by breaking through toward Tashkent across the Kender-Davan pass in the Turkestan Range, crossing the Murza-Rabatskaya Steppe around the range to reach Chinaz, and crossing the Syr-Dar'ya.⁴⁷

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Open English intervention in Turkestan began on 12 August 1918. British troops were expected to act as a kind of nucleus around which local counter-revolutionary forces would gather. This idea was expressed by D. Lloyd George at the interallied conference of Entente countries in London as early as March 1918.⁴⁸ Preparation for the intrusion lasted many months. The territory of Iran was used as the springboard. English troops were brought there from India and Mesopotamia. They had already reached the border of the Transcaspian Oblast in March.⁴⁹ The formation of a military mission was begun in Meshkhed under the direction of the British general consul in Khorasan, Gray. In the summer of 1918 General Malleson took command of the mission.⁵⁰ At the same time General Densterville was forming a similar mission in Khamadan in western Iran. Intensive work was done to establish lines of communication to the borders of Turkestan and the Transcaucasus. After the fall of the Baku commune in late July 1918 the ring of interventionists surrounding the Soviet Republic on the south was broken only in Turkestan. When the English penetrated the Transcaspian region the ring was connected there too. At the 13 November 1918 meeting of the members of the cabinet in London Lord Milner, representing the war department, stated that it was necessary to eliminate Bolshevism "in the regions of the Black Sea," and specified that he meant "the Caucasus, the Don region, and Turkestan."⁵¹ The White Guard newspaper observed that the "Allies" had "broader assignments, unquestionably. Our common task is to wipe out the Tashkent outpost and liberate the road between Samara and Krasnovodsk from any obstacles. The strategic importance of this great road is enormous. It connects the English Baghdad front with the Volga, Czechoslovakian, and Ural fronts."⁵²

The colonialists and White Guards suffered a major defeat in the very first encounters with the Red Army near Bayram-Ali on 13 August and near Merv on 16 August. On 19 August General Malleson signed a treaty with the SR-Menshevik government of the Transcaspian according to which England received the "right" to take Soviet Turkestan and turn it into a colony. The protocol envisioned British aid to the White Guards and Basmaks in the form of troops, military instructors, field guns, machine guns, airplanes, rifles, cartridges, and explosives.⁵³ In Western historiography this treaty is treated as aimed at "suppression of Bolshevism in Turkestan."⁵⁴ The plan of struggle against Soviet power contemplated a series of successive strikes from outside and the organization of uprisings by local nationalists and White Guards at the most important points in the Turkestan Republic. Rebellions were to be instigated in Tashkent, Samarkand, and the cities of the Fergana valley. The Basmaks were assigned to take Tashkent, and the Bukhara Emirate was to support the offensive of the counterrevolutionary forces.⁵⁵ The American and English agents led by Treadwell were at the same time giving supplementary training to a detachment of Austrian and German prisoners of war who were also expected to fight in Turkestan. Malleson later recalled that the British High Command intended to make every effort to take control of the Central Asian Railroad and, if possible, all shipping on the Caspian Sea.⁵⁶

The Basmaks received broad financing. In February 1919 the English consul in Kashgar gave the former Tsarist consul 100,000 rubles to pass on to the leaders of the bands. Russian merchants and White Guards who had fled from Turkestan and were living in Kashgar appropriated 155,000 rubles.⁵⁷

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Intensive propaganda was carried on among the Basmaks. This propaganda was carried on by the "Indian-Turkish mission" organized in January 1919. By early 1919 Basmak gangs were openly attacking Fergana, Namangan, and other cities. The situation that had developed in the Fergana region was described as follows by the representative of the Turkestan Central Executive Committee: "The numerous and highly mobile bandits have in fact taken control of the entire region except for certain fortified points in the Russian parts of the cities."⁵⁹ Basmak centers existed in other places as well: the Matcha Begstvo near Tashkent (Ablyk) and later the Bukhara and Khorezm republics. There too the bands were organized under foreign leadership. England, after approving formation of the Matcha Begstvo on the headwaters of the Zeravshan River beyond Oburdon Pass, staged an election there to choose a delegation to travel to London for "advice" and "aid." The delegation returned to Matcha in the summer of 1919 with a promise of all possible support.⁶⁰

Soviet authorities took effective steps to organize the struggle against the Basmaks and their instigators. Revealing the true roles of Treadwell and Bailey was significant. When the Turkestan Cheka [Extraordinary Committee] received substantiated information that these men were the leaders of the anti-Soviet actions and Basmak bands, Treadwell was put under house arrest by authorization of the RSFSR People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs.⁶¹ In March 1919 the U. S. Government recalled him.⁶² Bailey went underground.⁶³ He discussed this step with Treadwell, focusing special attention on establishing direct contacts with the Basmaks.⁶⁴ The anti-Soviet rebellion in Tashkent in January 1919 failed. The arrival of General Corey, chief of staff to the Entente commander of troops in the Balkans and Caucasus, in occupied Ashkhabad in March 1919 for the purpose of inspiring the White Guards and Basmaks to greater activity came to nothing. Malleson's attempt to distribute a petition among the Turkmens with a "request" to the English to remain in Turkestan for a long time was also unsuccessful.

The situation that had developed in Afghanistan by the start of 1919 also played a certain part in the failure of the English intervention. On 20 February 1919 the English puppet Emir Khabibulla-Khan was killed. The new Emir, Amanulla-Khan, declared Afghanistan an independent state and sent an ambassador to Soviet Russia in April 1919.⁶⁵ After this the British imperialists, withdrawing their forces from Turkestan, focused special attention on supporting the Basmaks. New subunits of English troops appeared in Kashgar, near Tashkurgan. They began building fortifications near Yangi Shark and Karamgalyk.⁶⁶ Kolchak sent a special mission to Fergana composed of two of his generals and two English officers.⁶⁷ They awarded Madamin-Bek the rank of colonel.⁶⁸ The objectives of the mission were revealed in a letter by the chief of Kolchak's general staff to the former Tsarist consuls in Kul'dzhe and Chugachak dated 8 October 1919, which read: "The military mission has been assigned to strike up relations and establish close communication with representatives of the powers that are friendly to us so that, with logistic support from them, partisan detachments can be organized from the inhabitants of certain parts of Turkestan to fight the local Bolsheviks."⁶⁹ The mission subsequently fulfilled the functions of intermediary between the Basmaks and Anglo-American agents and also helped unify the Basmaks with detachments of local Russian kulaks.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Madamin-Bek had already been promised permanent aid in the form of guns and gold by this time.⁷⁰

In late August 1919 the fate of the Turkestan Republic was being decided on the Orenburg-Aktyubinsk front. This was where the Soviet authorities concentrated their primary attention, and during those same weeks the united forces of the Basmaks, kulaks (a whole large unit of kulaks commanded by K. Monstrov had been armed in Southern Kirghizia), White Guards, and local bais reached agreement to isolate Fergana from the rest of Turkestan and destroy rail, telephone, and telegraph lines. They adopted a plan for a combined offensive against the city.⁷¹ Intensive distribution of anti-Soviet flyers, proclamations, and appeals was begun. One of them contained an appeal to call a Constituent Assembly at which half of the places would be given to Muslims.⁷² In September fighting against the Basmaks broke out near Andizhan. The bandits were dispersed and Og and Dzhelal-Abad were liberated from them.

The Red Army's breakthrough into Turkestan and connecting the central zone of the country with the Turkestan Republic played a large part in the Bamak movement. In October 1919 the Commission on Turkestan Affairs (Turkkomissiya) of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and RSFSR Soviet of People's Commissars was formed; it later became the Commission of the Turkestan Bureau of the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik). The members of the commission were Frunze, V. V. Kuybyshev, Ya. E. Rudzutak, F. I. Goloshchekin, and Sh. Z. Eliava. The Commission on Turkestan Affairs and the Communist Party of Turkestan were guided in their activities by Lenin's letter entitled "To the Communist Comrades of Turkestan." In it Lenin emphasized the great importance of establishing correct relations with the indigenous population.⁷³

During a short time in April and May of 1920 two detached cavalry brigades were formed from volunteer working people in Fergana, plus a detached cavalry brigade in Senirech'ye and the Turkmen Cavalry Brigade. Following an appeal 30,000 Uzbeks, Tajiks, Kirghizes, Kazakhs, and Turkmens enlisted in the Red Army and became defenders of the Soviet Fatherland. The Commission for Turkestan Affairs and the Turkestan Front worked out a more clear-cut line for the struggle against the Bamkak movement.⁷⁴ "The difficulty is not in defeating the enemy militarily," Frunze wrote. "The difficulty lies in making the millions of working Muslims understand that the Basmak movement is their enemy and that fighting it is the sacred mission of the working people."⁷⁵ Political work among the working population of the local nationalities, correct food policy, and material aid to the peasants were emphasized. Additional volunteer detachments of communists and Komsomol members were formed in the native villages.

A comprehensive program of political, economic, and military measures created favorable conditions for greatly weakening the Basmak movement. To revive it the imperialists called a meeting of the bandit leaders on the Soviet-Chinese border on 22 October 1919. Representatives of the reactionary part of the Muslim clergy and local bourgeoisie also participated. The meeting was directed by Uspenskiy, an English agent and former Tsarist consul in Kashgar. It was decided to organize a "Provisional Fergana Government" headed by Madamin-Bek. Uspenskiy promised to intensify aid to the Basmaks and gave them boxes of guns and shells as an "advance." After

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

formation of the puppet "government," imperialism's ties with the Basmak movement became even stronger. The English consul was a member of Madamin-Bek's headquarters and in fact directed his activities.⁷⁶ The "Provisional Fergana Government" attempted to bring all the leaders of the bands under its control by eliminating differences among them and working out a general plan of action. The 150 Fergana bands were organized into four large detachments.

Intensive fighting began in early 1920. The Tatar Brigade, which consisted of Red Army soldiers who spoke the local languages, and the Muslim Battalion imeni 3 Internatsional were sent to Fergana to participate. Several bandit leaders joined the Red Army side and Muslim cavalry regiments were formed from their subordinates. In March 1920 Madamin-Bek surrendered and virtually the entire Fergana region was cleared of bandits. In the summer, however, a new wave of the Basmak movement developed. This rebirth was the result of efforts by imperialist accomplices who placed their hopes on Kurshimat, an out-and-out criminal and privateer. The reactionary mullahs declared him the "true fighter for Islam." Fergana again became the scene of military operations. Frunze arrived. In his appeal entitled "To the Muslim Population of the Fergana Region" he emphasized that the local population itself, "as one person," should "come to the aid of the authorities in rooting out the Basmak movement."⁷⁷ Local working young people, in particular the Komsomol organization of Fergana and A. Naviyev, one of its leaders who later died in battle with the enemy, took an active part in the struggle. International detachments under the command of E. F. Kuzhelo also participated in the operations.

There were several thousand Basmaks in Fergana, Khiva, and Bukhara in the spring of 1921. Then in October 1921 Enver-Pasha, the former Turkish minister of war and one of the leaders of pan-Islam and pan-Turkism, moved to Central Asia. His platform, as English General G. Macmun observed, was to establish an "empire" consisting of Persia, Bukhara, Khiva, Afghanistan, and Turkey.⁷⁸ Anti-Soviet propaganda intensified under the call for a holy war. The Basmaks were depicted as "true defenders of Islam." In this situation it was enormously important to carry out Lenin's instructions: "Win the trust of the natives; win it three times and four times over; prove that we are not imperialists, that we tolerate no inclination in that direction. This is an issue of world importance, without exaggeration. In this we must be absolutely strict."⁷⁹ Neither foreign caravans with weapons and ammunition nor the whining of the imperialist press about the "inevitable death" of Soviet power in Central Asia was able to save the "commander of the armies of Khiva, Bukhara, and Turkestan," as Enver called himself, from defeat. He was finished off in the summer of 1922. Basmak centers lasted longest in Khorezm where the Dzhunaid-Khan band was eliminated in 1924, and in Bukhara, where Ibragim-Bek's band was wiped out in 1926. The actions of Dzhunaid-Khan were directed by English agent Shukinbayev. Ibragim-Bek spoke of this later at trial.⁸⁰

The elimination of the Basmak movement was one of the indicators of successful transformation of the Bukhara and Khorezm people's republics into socialist republics and implementation of national boundaries and formation of Uzbek and Turkmen SSR's, the Tajik ASSR, and the Karakirgiz and Karakalpak autonomous oblasts in Central Asia. Peaceful building and reconstruction of the economy, especially implementation of land-water and other reforms, drew many people who for various reasons had been linked to Basmak

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

leaders or were simply confused away from the Basmak camp. The leaders of the bands did not lay down their arms immediately. As long as the exploiter strata lasted in Central Asia there was a class base for the Basmak movement. Now and again new "emir-lyash kurbashi" ("supreme commanders") would appear, for example the Turkish officer Salim-Pasha and Fayzula Maksum. The center of Basmak leadership finally moved out of the country. Reinforcements were sent from there, sometimes directly from England.⁸¹ The last wave of the Basmak movement, caused by the general upsurge of anti-Soviet activity by international imperialism at that time and its development of new interventionist plans against the USSR, came in the late 1920's and early 1930's. On this occasion the Basmaks unsuccessfully tried to stop large-scale collectivization of agriculture.

The principal factor in defeating the Basmak movement was consistent implementation of the Leninist principles of nationality policy by Soviet authorities in Central Asia and the measures taken by the Communist Party to improve present agriculture, which offered the bulk of the local population the hope for a new and better life. Consolidation of the international status of the Soviet State was very important. The collapse of the Basmak movement represented a complete failure of the plans of international imperialism to break Central Asia away from the USSR and subjugate its population.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Turkish verb "basmak" means to attack, suppress, and pressure.
2. For more detail on this, see A. Babakhodzhaev, L. Landa, A. Stanishevskiy, and N. Khalifin, "The Failure of the Aggressive Plans of the Anglo-American Imperialists in Central Asia," ZVEZDA VOSTOKA, 1951, No 8; L. M. Landa, "American Imperialism — Active Organizer of the Anti-Soviet Intervention in Central Asia (1918-1920)," TRUDY MUZEYA ISTORII UZBEKSKOY SSR, Tashkent, 1954, Vol II.
3. Landa, op. cit., p. 24.
4. See S. R. Konopka, "Turkestanskiy Kray. Putevoditel'" [The Turkestan Region. Guidebook], Tashkent, 1910.
5. Seyers, N., and Kan, A., "Taynaya Voyna Protiv Sovetskoy Rossii" [The Secret War Against Soviet Russia], Moscow, 1947, p 117.
6. Malyshev, K. I., "The Defeat of Anti-Soviet Intervention in Southern Kirghizia," Candidate's Dissertation, Moscow, 1956, pp 19-20.
7. ZVEZDA VOSTOKA, 1953, No 5, p 103.
8. Eventov, L. Ya., "Inostranny Kapital v Neftyanoy Promyshlennosti Rossii" [Foreign Capital in the Russian Petroleum Industry], Moscow-Leningrad, 1925, pp 62, 85, 89.
9. Ibid., pp 44-62.
10. Gindin, I. F., "Russkiye Kommercheskiye Banki" [Russian Commercial Banks], Moscow, 1948, p 362.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

11. Landa, op. cit., p 25.
12. "Otchet Russko-Azitskogo Banka za 1910 g." [Report of the Russian-Asian Bank for 1910], St. Petersburg, 1911, p 2.
13. Landa, op. cit., p 25.
14. Babakhodzhayev, op. cit., p 135.
15. "Arkhiy Polkovnika Khauza" [The Archives of Colonel House], Vol 4, Moscow, 1944, pp 152-153.
16. Kunina, A. Ye., "Proval Amerikanskikh Planov Zavoyevaniya Mirovogo Gospodstva v 1917-1920 gg." [The Failure of American Plans To Gain World Domination in 1917-1920], Moscow, 1954, p 95.
17. Girshfel'd, A., "The Role of the United States in Organizing the Anti-Soviet Intervention in Siberia and the Far East," VOPROSY ISTORII, 1948, No 8, p 20.
18. Miller, D., "My Diary of the Conference of Paris," Vol IV, New York, 1926, pp 219-220.
19. ISHTRAKIYUN, Tashkent, 21 March 1918.
20. GOLOS SREDNEY AZII, Ashkhabad, 17 August 1918.
21. Densterville, L., "Britanskiy Imperializm v Baku i Persii. 1917-1918 gg." [British Imperialism in Baku and Persia. 1917-1918], Moscow, 1925, pp 122-123.
22. DIE POST, 6 March 1919.
23. TsGAOR SSSR [Central State Archives of the October Revolution, High State Government Bodies and State Administrative Bodies, USSR], Fund 1318, Inventory 1, File 627, Sheet 78.
24. TsGAOR UzSSR, Fund R-17, Inventory 1, File 317A, Sheet 80.
25. Landa, op. cit., p 29.
26. Among those in Tashkent in 1918 were the French attaches Castagne and Capdeville, the Czechoslovakian "representative" Gotfried, the Romanian charge d' affaires" Baltariu, Swedish representatives Hall, Von Schulman, and Studen the Danish "delegate" Braun, Belgian consul de Sterc, the Germans Zimmerman and Wohlbrueck, J. Davis and J. Brennig, representatives of the American Young Men's Christian Association, and others.
27. TsGAOR UzSSR, Fund R-25, Inventory 1, File 27A, Sheet 2 (back).
28. TRUDY MUZEYA ISTORII UZBEKSKOY SSR, File II, p 36.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

29. Castagne, J., "Les Basmatshis" [The Basmaks], Paris, 1925, p 20.
30. SOLOVETSKIYE OSTROVA, 1926, No 4, p 62.
31. His report on his activities in Turkestan was discovered in the national archives of India, in the secret fund of the "Bureau of Special Information" (K. A. Gafurova, "The Documents Exposed," VOPROSY ISTORII, 1970, No 8), see also F. M. Bailey, "Mission to Tashkent," London, 1946.
32. "Report of the Kashgar Mission, 1918-1920," foreign and political department. Special bureau of information, 1920, No 22(6), p 3.
33. TsGAOR SSSR, Fund 130, Inventory 2, Fil2 762, Sheet 230.
34. Niallo, A., "Ocherki Istorii Revolyutsii i Grazhdanskoy Voyny v Kirgizii i Sredney Azii" [Essays on the History of Revolution and Civil War in Kirghizia and Central Asia], Frunze, 1941, p 64.
35. Bailey, op. cit., p 156.
36. Zevelev, A. I., "Iz Istorii Grazhdanskoy Voyny v Uzbekistane" [From the History of Civil War in Uzbekistan], Tashkent, 1959, p 89.
37. Frunze, M. V., "Izbranyye Proizvedeniya" [Selected Works], Vol I, Moscow, 1957, p 314.
38. Timoshkov, S. P., "Bor'ba s Interventami, Belogvardeytsami i Basmachestvom v Sredney Azii" [The Struggle Against Interventionists, White Guards, and the Basmak Movement in Central Asia], Moscow, 1941; Timoshkov, S. P., "Bor'ba s Angliyskimi Interventami v Turkestane" [The Struggle Against English Interventionists in Turkestan], Moscow, 1941.
39. Churchill, W., "Mirovy Krizis" [The World Crisis], Moscow, 1932, p 105.
40. "Dokumenty po Istorii Grazhdanskoy Voyny v SSSR" [Documents on the History of the Civil War in the USSR], Vol I, Moscow, 1940, p 492.
41. "Arkhiv Polkovnika Khauza," op. cit., Vol III, Moscow, 1939, p 275; Vol IV, pp 152-153.
42. TsGASA [Central State Archives of the Soviet Army], Fund 149, File 51, Sheet 90.
43. Ibid., Fund 110, Inventory 2, File 409, Sheets 35-38.
44. Lenin, V. I., "PSS" [Complete Works], Vol 37, p 7.
45. SOLOVETSKIYE OSTROVA, 1926, No 4, p 63.
46. Ibid., 1926, Nos 5-6, p 37.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

47. Gafurova, op. cit., p 37.
48. Lavrov, S. V., "The Struggle in British Political Circles Concerning the Anglo-Soviet Negotiations of 1920-1921," VOPROSY ISTORII, 1977, No 6, p 61.
49. TsGAOR UzbSSR, Fund R-25, Inventory 1, File 118, Sheet 70.
50. The Malleson mission was also referred to by the acronym "Malmis."
51. Ullman, R. H., "Anglo-Soviet Relations, 1917-1921," Vol II, Princeton-Oxford, 1968, p 14.
52. GOLOS SREDNEY AZII, Askhabad, 17 August 1918.
53. "Kto Dolzhnik" [Who is the Debtor], Moscow, 1926, pp 396-399.
54. Ullman, op. cit., Vol I, 1961, p 319.
55. SOLOVETSKIYE OSTROVA, 1926, No 4, p 68-69.
56. Malleson, V., "The 26 Commissars," Russian translation in the manuscript fund of the Institute of Party History of the Central Committee of the Uzbek Communist Party, Fund R-2055, Sheet 6.
57. Zevelev, op. cit., p 117.
58. TsGASA, Fund 110, Inventory 4, File 275, Sheet 26.
59. Ibid., Fund 149, File 69, Sheet 79.
60. Polyakov, Yu. A., and Chugunov, A. I., "Konets Basmachestva" [The End of the Basmak Movement], Moscow, 1976, p 51.
61. The report of the Government of the Turkestan Republic said that the instigators of the anti-Soviet conspiracy were the imperialists and "foreign capital" (NASHA GAZETA, Tashkent, 9 October 1918).
62. TsGAOR UzbSSR, Fund R-25, Inventory 1, File 31, Sheet 14; File 120, Sheet 34.
63. THE TIMES, confirming that Bailey went underground, wrote that he operated "in Turkestan for more than a year without being discovered," which included his time in Bukhara (Zevelev, op. cit., p 246).
64. Gafurova, op. cit., p 38.
65. For more details see M. A. Khalfin, "Afghanistan Wins Independence," VOPROSY ISTORII, 1980, No 6.
66. TsGASA, selection of items, Inventory 2, File 835, Sheet 188.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

67. According to other information, three officers, an interpreter, and escorts (TRUDY MUZEYA ISTORII AN UZBSSR, Vol II, p 37).
68. ZHIZN' NATSIONAL'NOSTEY, Moscow, 1923, No 1, p 89.
69. TRUDY MUZEYA ISTORII AN UZBSSR, Vol II, p 38.
70. Party Archives of the Central Committee of the Uzbek Communist Party, Fund of Party History, 1919, Sheet 16 (back).
71. TsGASA, Fund 25859, Inventory 1, File 44, Sheet 97.
72. Ibid., Inventory 6, File 47, Sheets 231-232.
73. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 39, p 304.
74. Nikolayeva, V. P., "The Commission for Turkestan Affairs as a Fully Empowered Organ of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik), VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, 1958, No. 2.
75. Frunze, op. cit., Vol 1, p 314.
76. TsGASA, Fund 110, Inventory 4, File 36, Sheets 271-273.
77. "M. V. Frunze na Frontakh Grazhanskoy Voyny" [M. V. Frunze at the Fronts of the Civil War], collection of documents, Moscow, 1941, pp 309-311.
78. Macmun, G., "Afghanistan from Darius to Ammanullah," London, 1923, p 288.
79. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 53, p 190.
80. Polyakov, op. cit., pp 107-111.
81. Babakhodzhaev, A. Kh., "Proval Angliyskoy Politiki v Sredney Azii i na Srednem Vostoke v Period Priznaniya Sovetskogo Gosudarstva De-Fakto i De-Yure" [The Failure of English Policy in Central Asia and the Middle East during the Period of De Facto and De Jure Recognition of the Soviet State], Tashkent, 1957, p 175.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Voprosy istorii", 1980

11,176
CSO:1807

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

SOVIET POLICY TO JEWS DEFENDED, ZIONISM ATTACKED

Kishinev IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK MOLDAVSKOY SSR. SERIYA OBSHCHESTVENNYKH NAUK in Russian No 3, 1980 signed to press 11 Nov 80 pp 32-40

[Article by M.A. Gol'denberg: "The Anti-Sovietism of Contemporary Zionism"]

[Text] A sharp galvanization of massed Zionist propaganda, which is distinguished by a clearly expressed anticommunist and anti-Soviet diversionary thrust, can be observed in the camp of our class adversaries. For this reason it is necessary in evaluating the role of Zionism in the current ideological struggle and in determining our attitude toward it to proceed from a most important proposition formulated by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev in the CPSU Central Committee Report to the 25th party congress: "There can be no room for neutralism and compromise in the struggle of the two outlooks. What is needed here is high political vigilance, active, prompt and convincing propaganda and the timely repudiation of hostile ideological diversions."¹

Let us examine certain facets of just one, but extraordinary important aspect of Zionist ideology and policy--its intrinsic anti-Sovietism.

The ungovernable hatred of the apologists of Zionism for the world's first socialist state appeared not today nor yesterday--the Zionists began to engage strenuously in the kindling of anti-Soviet passions immediately following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The facts testify that the Zionist leaders of old Bessarabia cooperated closely with the royal administration and local nationalists on a counterrevolutionary, anti-Soviet platform. For example, at a celebration in honor of M. Slutskiy, chairman of Kishinev's Jewish community and a ringleader of local Zionist organizations, in 1931 the "hero of the day" was greeted not only by the Zionist-clerical "elite" headed by Chief Rabbi of Bessarabia, L. Tsirel'son, but also by representatives of the municipal authorities and also P. Khalip and G. Pynt',² the regrettably well-known ringleaders of the "Sfatul tseriy" Moldavian bourgeois-nationalist organization.

And in our day imperialist propaganda assigns international Zionism an increasingly marked role in line with the exacerbation of the ideological confrontation in the world arena, and its apologists "specialize," moreover, in "illustrating" the non-existent "Jewish question" in the USSR. This "problem" determines the basic content of all their exertions in the field of "Sovietology," corresponding to the principles of the "division of labor" accepted in the imperialist camp.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

As Comrade M. Wilner, general secretary of the Israeli Communist Party, observed, the same Zionist ruling circles which are pursuing a policy of harsh oppression of the Palestinians on the occupied territories "are, without batting an eyelid, organizing propaganda campaigns in connection with a failure to observe human rights and national discrimination in...the Soviet Union. Anti-Sovietism is a most dreadful poison in our country, more dreadful than the poison of anti-Arab chauvinism and militarism."³

The incessant moaning about the "oppression" of Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality, who are allegedly the target of anti-Semitic persecution, resounds from day to day in the camp of the Zionist faultfinders. And inasmuch as the mass information media in the West are more often than not controlled directly or in disguised form by Zionist organizations or support the Zionists by virtue of community of reactionary class interests such calumny receives the most extensive dissemination by no means only in the milieu of Philistines of Jewish extraction. In addition, what is revealed here is a gamble not only on the excitement of anti-Sovietism--a most important primordial postulate of Zionist doctrine, which is that anti-Semitism is ineradicable, makes itself felt. In the Zionist interpretation anti-Semitism is a timeless phenomenon and is always the parallel condition of every non-Jew in any social situation. Zionist "theoreticians" expunge from anti-Semitism objective causality and psychologize it, shifting it from the sphere of social activity to the sphere of the mind. And insofar as they substitute mental for class-economic factors, anti-Semitism is divorced from the objective course of social development, as a consequence of which the antiscientific conclusion of the impossibility of its elimination is born.

The defenders of Zionism essentially absolve the bourgeois world order of responsibility for the constant reproduction of anti-Semitism since in their interpretation hatred of Jews is the attribute of the "invariable nature" of any person of non-Jewish national origin, whom they portray as the receptacle of ineradicable dark and destructive instincts. But man's true nature is not an invariable and predetermined substance; it is a specifically social essence. The content of inter-nation relations ensues not from some a priori enmity but from the mode of production which has become established in a given specific society and from its social structure and political institutions. According to Zionist views, however, anti-Semitism and type of society are noncontiguous concepts. This approach leads to the illegal extrapolation to socialist states of conclusions which are true of exploiter relations.

An analysis of contemporary Zionist sources makes it possible to highlight some of the principal invectives of the anti-Soviet attribute:

1. The main artery chosen by Zionist propaganda consists of an attempt to ascribe to the Soviet Union a "state anti-Semitism being implanted in planned fashion" inasmuch as "Jewish national culture" is allegedly being suppressed here. This "suppression" amounts, among other things, to the fact that "a ban has been imposed" on its allegedly indispensable form of embodiment--the ancient Jewish language (Hebrew). For the mythical "world Jewish nation," to which, in Zionist concepts, Soviet Jews also belong, Hebrew is the native tongue, without which "Jewish cultural values" cannot exist.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

However, regarding Hebrew as the native tongue in respect of Soviet Jews is, at the very least, strange for they have never known it. There is, therefore, no need to ban what practically no one uses (if we do not count synagogue services, at which the believers, elderly people, as a rule, mechanically say in this language prayers whose meaning is virtually incomprehensible to them).

The dead "holy" language of Hebrew was artificially revived by Jewish nationalists at the end of the last century. They see it--and do not hide this fact--as a means of realizing Zionist goals. "Revival of the ancient Jewish language as a secular language is connected with Zionism," the "Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel" candidly writes. And if the connection of Hebrew with Zionism is openly proclaimed by our enemies, then in this rarest of instances we have to agree with them.

Language is merely the form by means of which a certain content is presented. And in the dialectical interaction of the twin philosophical category of "form and content" it is precisely content which is the leading aspect. What content would the international Zionist concern like to impose on Soviet Jews with the aid of Hebrew? A purely Zionist content, of course. It is an endeavor to suggest to them a sense of belonging to a "world Jewish nation," in which, incidentally, were the Zionists to succeed in accomplishing the plans for its "Hebrewization," there would appear at least one of the genuine characteristics of a nation which it lacks entirely. It is an attempt to incline them in the direction of emigration and prepare them "in the best way" for "absorption in the land of their forefathers." It is a vain attempt to impose Zionist "spiritual values" on them. It is a brake block capable, in the calculations of Zionist circles, of halting the objective process of assimilation. All these plans, however, are built on sand. They cannot be crowned with success not only in respect of Soviet Jews but also the Jews of the Western capitalist states.

2. In the USSR, the Zionist disinformers repeat again and again, the Jewish colloquial language (Yiddish) is also being eradicated by administrative methods. This language is indeed losing its positions in our country, but for entirely different reasons. In the process of the voluntary, natural process of the Soviet Jews' rapprochement with the Russian, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Moldavian and other peoples of the USSR they long since well assimilated the languages of these peoples, primarily Russian. Under these conditions increasingly less and increasingly rare use is made of Yiddish.

After all, analogous phenomena can be observed all over the world, particularly in the industrially developed states, and Zionist authors simply cannot fail to notice them. One of the works says: "The sphere of use of the Yiddish language is similar in our day to that of shagreen leather. Evidence of this is the continuous decline in the Yiddish press, which was once very powerful, but which today runs to only a few names. This decline is just as severe in the United States as in Israel and in France as in Britain."⁵ But a little later on (p 213) in this "work" philippics resound against the USSR, which "prevents" its citizens of Jewish nationality having either newspapers or books in Yiddish.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to understand why, for example, the fact that in the United States, where the Jewish population is three times that of Soviet Jews and where only one newspaper in Yiddish, and artificially supported at that (of the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

10 in existence in the first postwar years),⁶ has survived appears to the Zionists as a "misfortune," albeit inevitable, but that in the USSR, where, as is known, the journal SOVETISH GEYMLAND (Moscow) and the newspaper BIROBIDZHANER SHTERN (Yevrey-skaya Autonomous Oblast) are published in the Jewish language, the "malicious suppression" of Jewish culture ~~is~~ Yiddish is under way.

But even if, contrary to actual requirements, the publication of various literature in the Jewish language were to increase many times over in the Soviet Union, this would not change the anti-Soviet course of the foreign Zionist organizations in the least. For the content of this literature would be democratic, progressive and socialist. And this corresponds least of all to what the Zionists wish to achieve. If all the Jewish schools, for which there has been absolutely no need, were to be restored in our country today, the anti-Soviet campaigns organized by the Zionist centers would not cease but would, perhaps, intensify even. For the same reason the content of the tuition and education would by no means be that "needed" by the Zionists zealots.

3. Directly related to the fabrications concerning the "persecution of the Jews and their national culture," which are aimed at inciting anti-Sovietism, are inventions concerning the "eradication of the Judaic religion," which is regarded by Zionists and Judaic clericalists as the foundation of this "culture." Special attention should be paid here to the malicious mixing and confusion of concepts with the aid of which any criticism of Judaism can be portrayed as an anti-Jewish attack.

It is necessary in this connection to reveal one feature which is not reflected in our special literature. In a number of West European languages (English, French, Spanish and so forth) the term "Judaism" has a dual meaning, signifying, depending on the context, both the corresponding faith and "Jewry." And inasmuch as it is in precisely these languages, and not Hebrew or Yiddish, that the lion's share of Zionist literature is published, this semantic singularity to some extent contains the premise for identifying denominational and ethnic indications so needed by our ideological enemies.

In Russian Judaism means, as is known, merely a certain religion, and nothing more. If, however, it is pretended that the Russian semantic scope of this concept coincides with, for example, the French, then inasmuch as Soviet authors regard Judaism on a par with any other faith as a brake on the path of social progress, the Zionist interpreter "translates" this proposition such as for it to appear that "Jewry is a barrier on the path of man's progress." Anti-Semitism is easily "exposed" with the help of such terminological machination.

The expanded interpretation of the "Judaism" concept, which allegedly also incorporates Jewish culture, language and history and the Jews themselves in addition to religion, has long been established in Zionist and clerical literature. Given this antiscientific approach to the phenomenon in question, any publication on Judaism which appears in the Soviet Union "proves to be" aimed against Jews per se. The fundamentally important fact that Marxist experts distinguish precisely between the concepts "Jew," "Judaism" and "Zionism" and under no circumstances permit their identification is, of course, glossed over.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

This ancient Zionist aim is undergoing certain modifications among various foreign authors, but its essence remains the same. Thus the bourgeois expert on the history of anti-Semitism, L. Polyakov, whose pro-Zionist and anti-Soviet orientation is not in doubt, writes: "The more anti-Jewish propaganda is developed in the East for foreign and domestic political considerations, the more necessary semantic precautions become, and for this reason the Bible and the state of Israel serve as a target, as is the practice in the Soviet Union...."⁷

However absurd it may be to attempt to pass off condemnation of the ruling circles of the state of Israel as an anti-Jewish act, the endeavor to portray scientific criticism of the Bible as a euphemism cunningly employed to conceal "anti-Semitic agitation" appears even more inane. Following this flawed logic, we would have to put Spinoza, Heine and Einstein, who, despite their Jewish origins, did not conceal their negative attitude toward Judaism and its "holy" books, among the anti-Semites.

Complaints that Judaism "is being suppressed in planned fashion" in the USSR will be seen in the true light if it is considered that this faith is experiencing a profound crisis in the West also. The Zionist authors of the book mentioned earlier, "Judaism," dolefully state that the said religion "is retreating step by step under the blows of industrial civilization, preserving only a few islets where loyalty to God remains the primary truth" (p 196). The "de-Judaization" of the indigenous Israelis, who are not confining themselves to a position of indifference with respect to the "faith of the fathers" but often openly expressing "seditious" antireligious opinions,⁸ has become a matter of deep anxiety for the Zionist leaders and the Rabbinate in Israel itself.

A report which appeared in the Western press is highly significant: American rabbis are extremely depressed by the fact that the majority of former Soviet Jews who emigrated to the United States avoid attending the synagogue.⁹ It appears that while these "formers" lived in the USSR, the road to the synagogue was "forcibly" barred to them, but in the United States they cannot be lured there anyhow. If even such people--for it is mainly the Jews whose minds have been clouded by every conceivable survival who take the path of emigration--are reluctant to attend the synagogue, despite all the benefits which bourgeois society promises them for piety, albeit affected, this confirms from an unexpected quarter the effectiveness of our atheistic propaganda. And, of course, this is convincing proof that the Zionist concept of the "suppression and devastation of Judaism" in the USSR is no more than a malicious myth.

If, for example, in the period 1978-1980 the Kishinev synagogue was attended on the most important Judaic holidays by 700-800 people, which is approximately 3 percent of the city's adult Jewish population, the perfectly natural questions is: why should it be considered that the "remaining" 97 percent do not visit the synagogue for the reason that the way to it is allegedly barred to them by some administrative obstacles? On what grounds is it to be expected that the longing for the synagogue is stronger in Soviet Jews, who have assimilated, as a rule, the scientific-materialist world outlook which prevails in country and who, as a whole, have no thought of leaving their true motherland, than in those whom the Zionist recruiters have succeeded in catching in their nets?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The testimony of [Ya. Tsur], former Israeli ambassador to Paris, serves as yet further proof of Zionist hypocrisy: "Many leaders of France's Jewish community are married to non-Jews, irrespective of whether the latter have been converted to Judaism or not."¹⁰ Consequently, the Zionist and clerical leaders are "exposing" in our country the same objective assimilative regularities which they not only observe all around them every day in the West but in whose power they themselves are.

The enormous significance which Zionist propaganda attaches to Judaism as the basis of the Jewish culture which is allegedly being destroyed in the USSR demands a clear idea of what the Zionists understand by it. The "cultural values" they need are based on glorification of the "god of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," "His chosen people" and the "Holy Land given to this people from above." Whereas for this, as also for any other bourgeois-clerical culture, there is no place on Soviet soil, all the necessary conditions have been created in our country for the development of progressive, democratic national cultures, the Jewish culture not excluded.

4. The criticism of Zionism on the part of Soviet authors is an indicator of flourishing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, the Zionist malevolents would have us believe. Someone has only to comment critically on Zionism for him to immediately be labeled an anti-Semite. If this person is a non-Jew, of course. If he is a Jew, he is just as unceremoniously declared a traitor and renegade. According to the Israeli "dove" M. Peled, in whose opinions it is sometimes possible to detect elements of commonsense, "persons of non-Judaic faith could be characterized as anti-Semites merely for attempting to suggest that Israel could have done more to show how far it is willing to go along the path leading to peace."¹¹

Such attacks are frequently also directed against bourgeois figures, far from Marxism, who have dared even in highly cautious form to entertain doubts about some aspects of the Zionist circles' practical activity. But insofar as the Soviet Union's position has nothing in common with the timid attempts to chide international Zionism and Israel's ruling circles for "partial errors" and "certain extremes" but consists of the resolute rejection of the totality of Zionist ideology and policy, to that extent false accusations of anti-Semitism resound with particular importunity against the Soviet Union. They are just as absurd as the attempts to declare the struggle against Ukrainian nationalism and pan-Turkism an insult to the Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Tatars and so forth or the exposure of the Moldavian bourgeois nationalists of "Sfatul tseriy" a violation of the Moldavians' national dignity.

Unscrupulousness and, in particular, the already mentioned terminological lack of principle enable the Zionist falsifiers to equate the far from identical concepts of "anti-Zionism" and "anti-Semitism" and to declare them interchangeable or, at least, to draw them right up next to one another. It is not necessary to prove that the criticism of Zionism, like any bourgeois nationalism, is conducted here from strictly class positions. And it is not directed against Soviet Jews and not against the Jewish working people of the capitalist world, including Israel, but corresponds to the true, correctly understood interests of workers of Jewish extraction, wherever they may reside.

V.I. Lenin, an ardent fighter against any variety of national oppression, adjured that Soviet people be equally intolerant of both Zionism and anti-Semitism. Having

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

defined Zionism as an ideology "utterly false and reactionary in essence," the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet state together with this categorized anti-Semitism as "the vile fanning of racial detachment and national enmity on the part of the exploiter classes."¹²

It is fitting to mention that at times the Zionists themselves have actually admitted that the struggle primordially waged against Zionism by the followers of Marx and Lenin is determined by class factors. A document drawn up at a secret Zionist gathering in Moscow immediately after the Great October Socialist Revolution which said "Socialism is in the way of Zionism" became widely known here.

Consequently, in documents not intended for "mass consumption" the ideologists of Zionism reveal their understanding of the fact that socialism and Zionism are antipodes. And this proves, their will notwithstanding, that an irreconcilable struggle between them is an inevitable consequence of their class incompatibility and their political opposition and not the result of national enmity.

We should not exaggerate the significance of the apologists of Zionism doing more than taking liberties with the conceptual apparatus on which they rely. This would lead to the conversion of fundamental social-class problems into purely semantic ones, which would correspond to the subjectivist philosophy of semantism and engender fallacies explaining class conflicts by an imperfection of speech and the incorrect use of individual words. But we cannot fail to see that the dishonest juggling with certain terms and the establishment of artificial intercrossing connections between them help the Zionists confuse credulous people and influence them in favor of the wave of anti-Sovietism. And for this reason it is essential to expose the semantic anarchy which has become firmly established in the Zionist lexicon. The strictly scientific delineation of the concepts which the Zionists arbitrarily identify is an important task.

Certain scholars and commentators, including those of Jewish extraction, have long been opposing Zionist terminological arbitrariness in the capitalist countries also. "Can you really not defend your cause," the public figure M. Liebmann tasks, addressing Zionists via the French newspaper LE MONDE, "without resorting to such demagogic reasoning as the crude and illegal confusion of anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism? What are your beliefs worth if you endeavor by means of such a lie to blackmail people and play on their feelings in order to prevent any discussion and any comparison of different viewpoints?"¹³

The "arguments" examined above, which are intended to "prove" that Soviet Jews are subject to discrimination, pursue two main goals: disparaging Lenin's nationality policy in the eyes of the world public and pushing as many people as possible onto the path of emigration, which is declared by the Zionists the sole means of "rescuing" Jewish citizens of the USSR from imaginary persecution. There is no need to adduce here data on the irreparably hobbled fate of those who have fallen victim to Zionist propaganda, irrespective of whether they have ended up in Israel or in the Western capitalist countries. We would draw attention merely to the indecent speculation of the Zionist and pro-Zionist press around the parameters of emigration sentiment. What is the value, for example, of a report in a reactionary French journal that 200,000 persons in the USSR...have been refused visas for Israel!¹⁴

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Meanwhile, as B.T. Shumilin, deputy USSR minister of internal affairs, reported, as of September 1978 some 2,249 persons had provisionally been refused such visas, on grounds provided for by the law, which constitutes only 1.6 percent of the total number of persons of Jewish nationality who have left the USSR.¹⁵ We have here a concrete "falsification index": the true number of "refuseniks" is almost 100 times less than the fabricated figure.

Lamentations over the "hard lot" which has allegedly become the fate of Soviet Jews are an important component of the noisy anti-Soviet campaign unleashed by hostile propaganda under the cover of a fraudulent concern for human rights. But the Zionist disinformers cannot conceal the fact that all USSR citizens, including those of Jewish extraction, enjoy in full the totality of rights guaranteed by the USSR Constitution. As Comrade L.I. Brezhnev pointed out, it "records more extensively, clearly and fully than anywhere else at any time the citizens' socioeconomic and political rights and specific guarantees of the exercise of these rights."¹⁶

Our press has repeatedly adduced the true facts testifying that Soviet Jews are not restricted in anything in any sphere, be it political or economic life, labor relations, science or any other sphere, and that they are not deprived in the least of either government awards or honorific titles. We would refer here to certain most recent data published in the weekly LE NOUVELLE DE MOSCOU (8 April 1979), which appears in French. In 1977 Jews constituted less than 1 percent of the USSR's population. But they represented 5.7 percent of scientific assistants, 5.2 percent of cultural workers, 6.5 percent of writers and journalists and 6.7 percent of lawyers. Jews constitute 10.8 percent and 12.5 percent respectively of Lenin and State prize winners in the sphere of science and technology and 9.7 percent and 11.8 percent in the sphere of literature and art. All this is graphic confirmation of the irrefutable truth that Jews in the USSR are an organic part of the new historical community of people--the Soviet people--and the internationalism embodied in the profound convictions and standards of behavior of Soviet people rules out any variety of national discrimination.

Further exposure of Zionist anti-Sovietism will remain in the foreseeable future one of our urgent tasks. It has to be admitted, we believe, that although our authors have devoted much effort to revealing the anti-Soviet essence of international Zionism, not enough has yet been done in this sphere. In particular, there has long been a need for a special monographic study which would thoroughly analyze the latest factual material, expose the flawed methodological basis of Zionist subversive anti-Soviet acts, classify them appropriately and study the motivational singularities and mechanisms of their action. The inclusion of Zionist anticommunism and anti-Sovietism in the broad context of global tasks set the "psychological warfare" service by monopoly capital and revelation of the general and particular in the activity of the international Zionist centers and their interaction with other detachments of bourgeois reaction, including those whose anti-Semitism is no secret, seem obligatory here. At the same time it is necessary to investigate in detail the as yet insufficiently developed, but fundamentally important problem of allies (both clearly self-determined and potential) in the struggle against Zionism, remembering that the criteria are to be found in the class and not the ethnic plane for there are both supporters (and direct membership of a Zionist party is by no means obligatory for a supporter) thereof and opponents both among Jews and among non-Jews.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The further elaboration of these questions will serve to accomplish a very urgent task of Soviet social scientists who are purposefully counteracting the ideological intrigues of imperialist circles.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Material of the 25th CPSU Congress," Moscow, 1976, p 74.
2. See Moldavian SSR Central State Archives, coll. 679, invent. 1, d. 5664, sheet 52.
3. PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA No 4, 1979, pp 3-4.
4. "Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel," New York, 1971, p 47.
5. R. Aron, V. Malka, A. Neher, "Le judaisme," Paris, 1977, p 206.
6. VIATA NOASTRA, Tel Aviv, 11 January 1977.
7. ETUDES, June 1979, Paris, p 764.
8. N.W. Cohen, "American Jews and the Zionist Idea," New York, 1975, p 149.
9. ISRAEL AND PALESTINE No 76, Paris, 1976, p 4.
10. Quoted from "Le judaisme," p 206.
11. PROBLEMES POLITIQUES ET SOCIAUX No 271, Paris, 1975, p 29.
12. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Works], vol 8, p 72; vol 7, p 245.
13. LE MONDE 28 March 1970.
14. INFORMATIONS CATHOLIQUES INTERNATIONALES No 529, Paris, 1978, p 14.
15. See "Belaya kniga" [White Book], Moscow, 1979, p 143.
16. L.I. Brezhnev, "Leninskim kursom" [Lenin's Way], vol VI, Moscow, 1978, p 531.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Shtiintsa", 1980

8850
CSO: 1807

END

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY